G.R.S. IX—5]

Previous references 1921—22 (Mis) **File No.** 265-4

Serial Nos. 22-24

Later references.

Mis 265-21-25 & 26
33-57
194-30-1-6

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 22 — 24

Part B for June 1923

SUBJECT

Scheme sent in regard to the better management of the affairs of the Sri Subramanya Temple, Tiruchendur Taluk

No. 3084 / Misc 265-21-24 & 26.6.23
to Mis Cir. for taking necessary action in regard to the appt. of members to represent Nagaram Sabha on the Committee of management.

G.R.S. 11] 1921-22

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Mar)

NOTES.

File No. 265-21

FILE HEADING.

Management of the Sri Subrahmanya Swami temple, Uppinangadi Taluk.

From

The Dy Comr Kanara S

No. C.484-21 Dated 26-5-23 Received

Diary No.	Enclos	Spare Copies	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Forwards copy of the Order of the Collector South Canara re the institution of a scheme with for the better management of the Sri Subrahmanya Swami temple.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

NOTES—First sheet

GPB—15,000—24-4-09

G. R. S. [II—8]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

D.

Letter C. No. 684 Dt 26.5.23 from the Dy. Comr, Hassan Dist

G.O. No. 2265-6 / Muz. 265-2, Dt 10-2-1923 sanctions the institution of a scheme suit for the better management of Sri Subrahmanyeswara Swami temple at Subramanya.

The Dy. Comr has sent up a typed copy of the Proceedings of South Canara Council according sanction certain persons Sections 91 and 93.

C.A.

N B Should rout ne notes be written on small slips, the notes must de copied, or slips pasted on this form.

W D 1660—GPE—1,50,000—3.5 21

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record

to file a petition [illegible]
in connection with the
management of Sri
Subrahmanya Swami temple.

Submitted
[illegible]
31/5/23.

This has not come
up through the Munsif's
Court

[illegible]

Dewsecy) 31/5/23

First Member) 31/5/23.

9870-9941
1.6.23 Secn. A. Yes

N. B.—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied on slips pasted on this form

Put
4.6.23

Draft Submitted
[illegible] 5/6/23.

Draft
5/6/23

G. R. S. III—3]

ROUTINE NOTES.

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record]

Issued
15/6/23

22. No. 7364 of 8/6/23
to the Asst. Comm.

Ref. the letter No C.
1684-21 dt. of 26.5.23
for necessary action —

From, the Insp.-Comm.
Letter no. C.1668 dt 2-6-23

forwards a copy
of the Collectrs' Rpt
regarding the institution
of a Scheme Srik,
and adds that the
Comm will be re
to submit

N B Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied, or slips pasted on this form.

WD 1850—GTE—1,50,000—2 5 23

G. R. S. III—3 Mwrai 265 — 24

ROUTINE NOTES

[To be used only for notes, requisitions, etc., not intended for permanent record.

in the case.

The Com^n will be kept in the file.

Submitted for orders.

11/6/23.

Para 7 of the Collector's Order dated 26.5.23 the Collector's attention is drawn to the matter of the management of the temple. Further steps will be communicated.

11.6.23

Yes. DCG 11/6/23

12/6/23

Vide D.O. dated 12.6.23

Reference is requested to letter No. 484 dt. 14.2.22 received from the Rev. Com^r Hindu R.E.

Vide D.O. dated 12.6.23 in the Collr's Proceedings (Mwr 265-24)

N B—Should routine notes be written on small slips, the notes must be copied or slips pasted on this form

Regarding the appln of the Arulalar and 3 non-hereditary members for Mr. M. Venkatarama Ayyangar Mr. Thirumalappaiya & Mr. K. Swaminathan

G. R. S. III-2,

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Mur File No. 203 of 19 21

Serial No

on the Committee of Management of the Temple. Measures may be taken in this matter on the subject of constitution of a Scheme which has to be taken up and a letter addressed to the Residency in the matter.

Now that the Collector of South Canara has started the ball rolling, necessary action has to be taken by the Dy Comr. under the instructions of the Mur. Comr.

A copy of the letter received from the Dy Comr. which is reply to above may be sent to the Mur Comr. with the request that necessary action may be taken in the matter of appointing Mysore representatives on the Committee of Management which may be appointed in the future for the control of the Temple affairs.

BG 13/6/23 (Asst Secy) DCS 13/6/23

Put up by Draft

Up 14/6/23

DCS

AV 14/6/23

NOTE—Contn. sheet

BG 15/

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

Secret File No. 65 of 19 21

Serial No.

Draft Ltr 2 - for approval

RB
15/6/23

OCS
15/6/23

Ernest Tattersall
16/6/23

10311-462
19.6.23

This letter should be issued by 23-6-23

RB
20/6

Draft approved.

RB
19.6.23

OCS
21/6/23

24

To

Lieut.-Gen. Commr.

To. a copy of letter No. 1681 of 14.2.23 & requests to take necessary action in the matter & submit a report of action taken in due course

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Muz 4]

SUBJECT ....

Diary No. of letter replied to _____

Muzrai Secretariat

( )

, the *192* .

Section

File No. 265-21

Serial No. 22

No. 2964
three

Date of issue 8.6.23

To

The Muz. Comr.

Signed by Ms. D.C. Subbarayappa Sri

In cont. of
G.O. no. 2245-6/ Muz.
265-21 Dy 10-2-1923
regarding the Scheme
~~Suit~~ for the better
management of Sri
Subrahmanya Swami
temple at Subrah

over.

Uppsinangadi Taluk,

I am directed to ~~forward herewith (copy)~~ for necessary action forward herewith an original letter No. C 4824-21 dated 26.5.23 together with its enclosure ~~No. DIS. 6015-22/E.P.~~ dated the 20th April 1923 from the South Canara Collector, receiving thereon Canara Hasan Dy. Comm. Letter No. 4824 dt 26.5.1923 according sanction to certain persons under Sections 92 and 93 of the Civil Pro. Code in connection with the management of the said estate.

I have etc.

by Order

Sd/- [illegible]

being the order of the Collector on the Canara on the subject

List of enclosures

Copied by

Examined by

WD 0563– GPB—2 500—27-7-22

C 1668 9 mrs
Cl two 8-6-23.

42-18 Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Dated, Bangalore, the 2nd June 1923.

GEN & REV SECRETARIAT 9 JUN 1923 MUZRAI D 2235

From

K. Chandy, Esq., B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore. 265-21-23

9 JUN 1923

To

T.E. Jayarama Aiyar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, Revenue Department,

Bangalore.

Sir,

Adverting to Government Proceedings No.2245-46/M.F.265-21-20 dated 10th February 1923 regarding the institution of a scheme suit for the better management of the Sri Subramanyaswami temple at Subrahmanya in the Uppinangadi Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith for the information of Government copy of letter C.C.No. 484-21 dated 26th May 1923 together with a copy of the Proceedings of the Collector of South Canara dated 20th March 1923 according sanction to the petitioners in the case to file a suit under -- Sections 92 and 93 of the Civil Procedure Code.

2. The Deputy Commissioner will be requested to submit a final report in due course.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. Chandy

Muzrai Commissioner.

A copy of the Collectr's Pro. received in the Branch, was sent to the Muz. Comr. on 8.6.1923. The Comr's file be kept in the Sec.

D.N. 11/6/23

Letter No.484-21/O.C. dated 26th ay 1923, from the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District, to the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore:

"With reference to your letter No.C.935 of 22-23 dated the 15th February 1923, forwarding a copy of C.O.No.2245-6/Muz.265-21-20 dated the 10th February 1923 regarding the institution of a scheme suit for the proper and better management of the Sri Subramanyaswami temple at Subramanya in the Uppinangadi Taluk, I have the honor to forward herewith for information, a copy of South Kanara Collector's letter No.R.Dis. 4015-22 dated the 23rd March 1923 together with a copy of his proceedings No.Dis.4015-22/T.I. dated the 20th March 1923, according sanction to the petitioners under sections 92 and 93 of the Civil Procedure Code, in connection with the management of the Sri Subramanya temple".

Copy.

Muzrai Commissioner. 7/6/23.

D.N.

Letter No.R.Dis.4015-22-E1. dated the 23rd March 1923 from the Collector of South Kanara, to the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District.

The Shri Subramanya temple - scheme suit - Sanction under Sections 92 and 93 of the Criminal Procedure Code. - accorded.

With reference to your letter No.484-21-O.C. dated 24th February 1923, I have the honor to forward herewith a copy of the Collector's Proceedings Dis.4015-22-E1. dated 20th March 1925 according sanction to the petitioners under Sections 92 and 93 of the Civil Procedure Code in connection with the management of the Shri Subramanya temple".

Copy.

for Muzrai Commissioner.

D.N.

7/6/23.

R.Dis.No.4015-22 dated the 20th March 1923 from the Collector of South Kanara, to the Deputy Commissioner, Hassan District.

Proceedings of the Collector of South Kanara, Beltangadi camp, dated 20th March 1923.

Present:- Rao Bahadur S.N.V. Rajachar, B.A., Collector.

Read petition under section 92 of Act of 1908 from

(i) Srinivasa Bhatta of Murulia village,

(ii) Sitarama Bhatta of Kepu village,

(iii) Yedavendracharya of Palpa village and

(iv) Srinivasaya of Kodiala village.

Read Government Memorandum No.9527-1 dated 25th May 1922 referring to the Collector of South Kanara letter from the Honourable the Resident in Mysore No.4079 dated 9th May 1922 enclosing copy of letter No.6066 Muz.265-21-10 dated 29th April 1922 from the Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Muzrai Department (in charge) to the Secretary to the Honourable the Resident in Mysore regarding the mis management of Sri Subramaniaswami temple at Subramanya in South Kanara District by the present moktessor Anantharama Sarma.

Heard M.R.Ry. B. Mangesha Rao, Pleader for petitioners 1, 3 and 4, M.R.Ry. R. Thammaji Rao, Amildar, Mangarabad Taluk on behalf of the Mysore Government and the 4th counter-petitioner Kukkole Anantha Bhatta.

Read also petition dated 19th March 1923 from the 1st counter-petitioner applying for adjournment of the enquiry for the reasons stated therein.

Read also the day book and ledgers for 1916-21 produced by the counterpetitioners.

ORDER..

The petitioners request me to exercise the powers under Section 93 of the Civil Procedure Code 1908 and to grant sanction to them under Section 92 for permission to institute a suit against the first respondent Ananta Ramappayya for certain reliefs.

2. There is no doubt that Subramanya is a very ancient and religious place owing to Sree Subramanyaswamy temple and Sampusnta Narasimhaswamy Mutt inside the temple and has been held in nigh veneration by all cla of Hindus. People from all parts of India resort to the temple

large numbers especially during the Champa Sashti Festival (December - January of each year). Owing to its sacredness and importance, this institution is paid an annual Tasdik of Rs.4,400/- by the British Government; the Mysore Government pays annually a cash grant of - Rs.581-13-0 to the temple for Naditaras and Deeparadhane expenses, besides annual grant of over Rs.2000/- for Barahazar Santarpane, i.e., feeding of 12,000 brahmins (6000 in the temple and 6000 in the Mutt) on the occasion of the Champa Sashti festival. The Government of Coorg also pays an annual amount of Rs.95/-. Besides these, the Mysore Government an annual grant of sandal wood both to the Mutt and the temple. The temple possesses landed property yielding an annual income of 400 muras of rice, 150 muras of paddy and about Rs.150/- in cash besides rent from buildings. In addition to the above, the temple receives annually about three to four thousand rupees from devotees and votaries who resort to the temple in numbers in all times of the year and a similar amount by way of jewels and offerings in kind. The total annual income may be estimated at about Rs.15,000/-.

3. According to the register of religious institutions prepared in Fasli 1252 (1842-43) this institution of Sri Subramanyaswamy had 7 Mokhtesors - 4 of whom including the Swamy of the Subrahmanya Mutt belonged to the Shivalli Brahmin Caste and the remaining 3 Shiva Brahmin or Stanik caste. (In Fasli 1269 (1859-60) the number of mokhtesors was only 3 including the Swamis of Subrahmanya Mutt. Until 1898, it would appear that the Swamy was managing both the temple and the Mutt. Ever since 1900 the institution is managed by only one mokhtesor, the vacancies in the other two not being filled up. From 1899 to 1918, the ~~last~~ 1st counter-petitioner's brother Baglodi Bhoju Rao was the sole mokhtesor and on his death in 1918, the 1st counter-petitioner stepped into his shoes, and has been in office since then. Though the Shivally Committee which has a control of the institution in question published a notification in the District Gazette for 1918 inviting applications for the two vacant Mokhtesorships, nothing was done in the matter and the 1st counter-petitioner is left in sole charge of the management of the institution.

4. The petitioners allege in para 4 of their petition several acts of misfeasance, malfeasance and misappropriation committed by the 1st counter-petitioner. A scrutiny of the accounts, day-books and ledgers produced by the 1st counterpetitioner shows that the 1st counterpetitioner has not

not been keeping proper and correct accounts and that there is ample room for misappropriation. In the first place, he has produced no stock - account or vouchers for articles purchased or sold nor has he produced an inventory of the temple property, jewels, valuables and vessels.

Secondly the account shows that among the articles purchased were potatoes, onions, bar-soap, pear soap, coffee, tobacco etc., which are prohibited for use in the temple. This would show misapplication of funds and misappropriation also. He has purchased she-buffaloes for the temple which is also a pronibited thing.

Thirdly a sum of Rs.810-3-9 is debited to the temple accounts being the amount spent by him in connection with the sanction petition of Subbaraya Hebbar in 1919. Fourthly valuable land belonging to the temple in Machina and Paranki villages was given out on voide peni by the 1st counter petitioner's brotner Bhoju Rao during his mokteesorship to his own fatner-in-law Sreenivasa Sampigetnaya for a period of 60 years for a low rental of Rs.381/- and that this first counterpetitioner has taken no steps to set aside the lease which is detrimental to the interests of the temple.

Fifthly the elephant Ganapati died in 1912 and his tusks have not been accounted for.

Sixthly it appears from the accounts that 38 maunds 16 seers 4 tolas of sandal wood billets were sold for Rs.575/-. No stock account is kept for sandal wood and it is not feasible to know how much was the stock and how much was sold. The Amildar of Manjarabad brings to my notice that the sandal sold was of the stock supplied by the Mysore Government for the use of the temple by making into a paste and distributing it to devotees after offering to the god and that it was never intended to be sold and that the first counter petitioner had no right to sell it.

Seventhly it appears from the accounts that 232 tolas of gold were taken from the temple stock for preparing a gold stick to the God and only 128 tolas were used. Nothing is known of the balance. There are several omissions and irregularities noticeable from the scrutiny of the accounts which convince me that a better management and proper accounting is called for imperatively. There are several items shown in the day book which do not find a ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ place in the ledger and similarly there are items shown in the ledger are not in the day book. I notice several items in the accounts which lead me to presume that the first counterpetitioner has been dealing with the temple funds as if

they were his own and that he needs account to nobody, forgetting that he is a moktesor bound to render proper and correct accounts.

The Amildar of Manjarabad brings to notice that Nitya Kattales (daily worship) a sum of Rs.35-8-3 is paid monthly to the temple by the Mysore Government which is intended for two Nandadeepam (two lights burning day and night without interruption and feeding of 12 Brahmins daily and that these are not maintained and no account for this amount is kept by the first counterpetitioner. In the letter of the Mysore Muzrai Department read above, it is stated that "The Muzrai Superintendent in Mysore and the Deputy Commissioner of the Hassan District who were both present at Subramanya last December to supervise the Barahazar Santarpane noticed that the management of the charities left much to be desired and have expressed the opinion that in view of the large amount spent by the Government of Mysore annually on the charities in Subrahmanya, the State should have an adequate voice in the management of the affairs of the temple, particularly as the conduct of the present Manager (Mr. Anantaramasharma) is understood to be unsastisfactory".

5. In view of the above facts and circumstances I find that the trust in respect of which the first counterpetitioner is the moktesor in the public trust of the kind contemplated in Section 92 of the Civil Procedure Code; that the petitioners are the wardars and worshippers and votaries at the temple having an interest in the trust and that it is highly undesirable that this large and sacred institution deriving large tasdiks and cash allowances from the British Government and the Native States and owning vast and valuable properties in the shape of lands, jewels, vessels and other things should be left in the sole management of a single moktesor in the person of the first counterpetitioner whose conduct as would appear from the accounts is highly questionable. I accordingly accord sanction to the petitioners namely:--

(1) Srinivasabhatta,
(2) Sitaramabhatta,
(3) Yadavendracharya,
(4) Srinivasaiya

to sue for the following reliefs:--

(a) Removing the first respondent from the moktesorship of Sri Subramanya temple,

(b) framing a scheme for proper and better management of the institution

(c) directing accountsto be taken and for a decree against respondents

respondents or such of them as are found liable to make good to the institution the losses caused to and sustained by the institution on account of the several acts of the commission and omissions set forth in the petition

(d) for setting aside the voidegeni granted to Srinivasa Sampigethaya & and any other alienations made by the mok esors for their own profits and

(e) for such other and further reliefs as may seem fit and proper and as the nature of the case may require, against the following persons:--

1. Ananta Ramappayya son of Ramakrishnayya, Machina village,
2. Peraje Krishna Phatta, son of Purushotama Phatta, amakunja,
3. Ramanna Sagrithaya, son of Krishna Sagrithaya, Alletti, and
4. Kukkole Anantayya Phatta, son of Dasa Phatta, Kukkole.

6. It may be noted here that the fourth counterpetitioner Kukkole Anantabhatta who appeared in person has no objection to the framing of the scheme for the better management of the institution.

7. In the event of any scheme being framed by the Court, I would suggest that in the interest of the Mysore Government which pays a large annual contribution to the temple and the Mutt and also the several devotees and worshippers of the South Canara and other Districts who resort to the temple in large numbers, not only during the annual Champa Sashti festival but at all times of the year, an adequate representation be made in the selection of a Committee to manage the institution by taking one or more representatives of the Mysore Government, one of the Sampushta Narasimhaswamy Mutt in the temple and one or two respectful Wargdars of the Uppinangadi Taluk in which the institution is situated.

Copy.

K Chandy

Muzrai Commissioner.

D.N.

C 16689

Office of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Dated, Bangalore, the 14th June 1923.

From

K. Chandy, Esquire, B.A.,

Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore,

Bangalore.

GEN. & REV. DEPT.
JUN 1923
MUZRAI
D 2271
4265

To

T.E. Jayarama Aiyar, Esq., B.A., P.C.S.,

Secretary to the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore, Revenue Department,

Bangalore.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.2964/M.F.265-21-22 dated 8th June 1923, I have the honor to invite kind attention to this office letter No.C.1663 of 22-23 dated 8th June 1923 submitting a copy of the proceedings of the Collector of South Canara according sanction for filing a scheme suit against the present managing Trustee of the Sri Subrahmanya temple.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

K. Chandy

Muzrai Commissioner.

This will be kept in the pending file.

18.6.23 D.N.

G. R. S. VI—(

SUBJECT.....

Diary No. of letter replied to

General and Revenue Secretariat
( )
, *the* 191 .

Date of issue 26.6.23

Signed by Mr. L.C. Sulelearayappa.

Section Mur
File No. 165-21
Serial No 24

No. 3084
One

To The Mur Cmr
in Negm

Sir,

In the reply to your letter No. C. 1668/22-23 dated the 23 June 1923 on the subject of a scheme suit for the better management of Sri Subrahmanya Swami temple, in the Uppi- Valuk, I am directed to invite reply to letter No. 68 of 14.2.22 sent from the D.C. Cow Hassan Dt. (Copy over. herein forwarded copy)

the appt of certain official
& non official gentlemen on
the managing Committee
and request that Resn
action may be taken in
the matter of the appt of
Indian representatives on
the Committee when ~~one~~
one is formed in the future
for the Control of the temples
affairs.

A report of action taken
may be kindly sent to us

Yours

19.6.23

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by